

United States Patent and Trademark Office





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,185	05/07/2001	Christopher W. Smith	4152-399001	2731
32588	7590 09/26/2003		·	
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.			EXAMINER	
2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061 SANTA CLARA, CA 95050			MCDONALD, SHANTESE L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3723	
			DATE MAILED: 09/26/2003	
				7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No. 09/851,185

Applicant(s)

Smith

Office Action Summary

Examiner McDonald, Shantese

Art Unit



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. · If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stetute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). **Status** 1) X Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Jun 26, 2003* 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) \ This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) X Claim(s) 1-15, 17, 18, and 20-25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above, claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) X Claim(s) 21-25 is/are rejected. 6) X Claim(s) 1-14 and 20 7) 💢 Claim(s) *15, 17, and 18* is/are objected to. 8) Claims are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. **Application Papers** 9) \square The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) \square The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b) □ Some* c) □ None of: 1. \square Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). a) U The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 6) Other:

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu et al. in view of Harrington.

Xu et al. teaches a substrate holder, 10, a continuously driven polishing belt, which has a width at least as wide as the substrate holder, 102, having a surface to contact at least a portion of the substrate, 116, held by the substrate holder, a backing member, 108, positioned on a side of the polishing belt opposite to the substrate holder, a fluid layer, (col. 3, lines 1-13), interposed between the backing member and the polishing belt, and an actuator, to urge the substrate and the belt into contact with one another, (col. 2, lines 60-67). Xu et al. also teaches uniformly spaced grooves having a depth of between 0.02 and 0.05 inches, a width between about 0.015 and 0.04 inches and a pitch between 0.09 and 0.24 inches, (col.5, lines 43-46). Xu et al. teaches all the limitations of the claims except for the grooves being oriented substantially perpendicular to the first direction of motion. Harrington teaches a belt with grooves perpendicular to the first direction of motion, (col. 5, lines 50-55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill

Art Unit: 3723

in the art at the time the invention was made, to provide the belt of Xu et al. with perpendicular grooves, as taught by Harrington, in order to enhance the belt's polishing capabilities.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claims 15,17 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 4. Claims 21-25 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

- Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16,19,20 and 24 have been considered but 5. are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shantese McDonald whose telephone number is (703) 308-8722.

Joseph J. Hail, III Supervisory Patent Examiner

Junt q. Halo

Technology Center 3700

S.L.M.

September 23, 2003